arXiv:1409.3708v1 [astro-ph.CO] 12 Sep 2014

Testing Gravity Theories Using Stars

Jeremy Sakstein

Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK
and
Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St. N, Waterloo, ON, N2L 6B9, Canada
j.a.sakstein@damtp.cam.ac.uk

Bhuvnesh Jain

Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
bjain@physics.upenn.edu

Vinu Vikram

Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
vinu@physics.upenn.edu

Modified theories of gravity have received a renewed interest due to their ability to account for the cosmic acceleration. In order to satisfy the solar system tests of gravity, these theories need to include a screening mechanism that hides the modifications on small scales. One popular and well-studied theory is chameleon gravity. Our own galaxy is necessarily screened, but less dense dwarf galaxies may be unscreened and their constituent stars can exhibit novel features. In particular, unscreened stars are brighter, hotter and more ephemeral than screened stars in our own galaxy. They also pulsate with a shorter period. In this essay, we exploit these new features to constrain chameleon gravity to levels three orders of magnitude lower the previous measurements. These constraints are currently the strongest in the literature.

Keywords: Modified Gravity; Cosmology.

1. Introduction

Einstein's general relativity has been the cornerstone of gravitational physics for nearly a century, but how well have we really tested it? To date, experimental tests have been limited to our own solar system and a handful of isolated systems such as binary pulsars and it has passed each with flying colours. We have not yet tested gravity in other galaxies or on larger — inter-galactic and cosmological — scales. Indeed, when one allows the theory of gravity to vary and examines constraints coming from linear cosmological probes, there are large regions in theory space

that are consistent with the current observations.[1] The apparent acceleration of the universe[2–4] is one of the biggest unsolved problems in modern physics and has led to a recent interest in modified theories of gravity as one possible explanation.[5] This then presents a problem: how can these modifications be large enough to give interesting cosmological dynamics whilst still satisfying the solar system bounds?

The solution is to construct theories of gravity that include *screening mechanisms* that act to hide any modifications in dense environments. One popular theory is *chameleon gravity*.[6,7] This theory includes an extra scalar degree of freedom coupled to matter, which results in a new or *fifth-* force. This would usually violate laboratory bounds but the chameleon mechanism acts to increase the field's mass by several orders of magnitude in dense environments, rendering the range of the force shorter than current experiments can probe.[8] The force-profile for a spherical object is shown in figure 1.



Fig. 1. The screening profile of a spherical object in chameleon gravity. The region interior to the screening radius $r_{\rm s}$ is screened and the force per unit mass (indicated by F) is simply the Newtonian force. The exterior region is unscreened and the force per unit mass is given by the Newtonian force law with $G \to G_{\rm eff}$.

There is a *screening radius* $r_{\rm s}$, inside which the total force is simply the New-

tonian one but outside which the value of Newton's constant G is increased. When this is zero the object is fully unscreened and when this is close to the object's radius it is said to be screened. The theory is parametrised by two model-independent quantities, χ_0 and α. Outside the screening radius, the effective value of G is

$$G_{\rm eff}(r) = G\left[1+\alpha\left(1-\frac{M(r)}{M(r_{\rm s})}\right)\right] \quad r > r_{\rm s}, \tag{1}$$

where $M(r)$ is the mass enclosed by a sphere of radius r. α then parametrises the strength of the fifth-force relative to the Newtonian one and is typically $\mathcal{O}(1)$. For example, $f(R)$ theories are chameleon models with $\alpha = 1/3$.[9] χ_0, the *self-screening* parameter, parametrises how efficient an object is at screening itself. An object of radius R with Newtonian potential $\Phi_{\rm N} \equiv GM/R$ is screened if $\chi_0 < \Phi_{\rm N}$, otherwise it is at least partially unscreened. Objects can additionally be screened by the Newtonian potential of their environment. The Milky Way is necessarily screened, which imposes the constraint[a] $\chi_0 \leq \Phi_{\rm N}^{\rm Milky\ Way} \sim 10^{-6}$. This means that in order to probe smaller values one must look at more under-dense objects, which are post-main-sequence stars and dwarf galaxies with potentials of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ and $\mathcal{O}(10^{-8})$ respectively.

In this essay we will examine the modified behaviour of stars in these theories and use them to place the strongest constraints to date. Cepheid variable stars pulsate faster at fixed luminosity owing to the increased strength of gravity. The period-luminosity relation used to measure distances to other galaxies is calibrated on local group stars and is hence incorrect in unscreened dwarf galaxies. By comparing the estimated Cepheid distances to a sample of unscreened galaxies with those found using a different method that is insensitive to gravitational physics we can place new bounds on the model parameters. Until recently, this was not possible but[11] have used data from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) to provide a map of unscreened galaxies in the nearby universe.

2. Stars in Modified Gravity

Stars are spheres of gas that burn nuclear fuel at their centres to provide an outward pressure gradient to combat gravitational collapse. In unscreened stars, the gravitational force is stronger and one would therefore expect the rate of nuclear burning to be larger. As a consequence, an unscreened star of fixed mass is brighter, hotter and more ephemeral than its screened counterpart. In[12] we presented a semi-analytic model of main-sequence stars in chameleon gravity and found that this is indeed the case. The important physics is captured by the hydrostatic equilibrium equation

$$\frac{{\rm d}P}{{\rm d}r} = -\frac{GM(r)\rho(r)}{r^2}, \tag{2}$$

[a]In fact, this constraint is not experimentally confirmed. If the Milky Way is screened by the local group it may be relaxed to $\chi_0 \leq 10^{-4}$ which has been placed using cluster statistics.[10]

which must be satisfied if the gravitational force is to be balanced by the pressure to maintain equilibrium. All of the gravitational physics is encoded in this equation and since chameleon gravity does not alter any other physics, one simply needs to replace G by $G_{\rm eff}(r)$ in order to solve for the modified stellar properties.

We have updated the stellar structure code MESA[13,14] to include this modified equation and the resultant predictions are accurate enough to allow a comparison with observational data. As an example, the Hertzsprung-Russell diagram for a solar mass star in general relativity and $f(R)$ gravity with $\chi_0 = 10^{-6}$ is shown in figure 2.



Fig. 2. The evolution of a 1 $M_\odot$ star in the Hertzprung-Russell diagram when the theory of gravity is general relativity (black line) and chameleon gravity (red line) with $\chi_0 = 10^{-6}$ and $\alpha = 1/3$ corresponding to $f(R)$ gravity.

Cepheid variable stars are 5–10 $M_\odot$ stars that have gone off the main-sequence. When situated in a narrow temperature gap in the Hertzsprung-Russell diagram known as the *instability strip* they pulsate with a known period-luminosity relation:

$$M_{\rm V} = a \log \tau + b(B - V) + c, \tag{3}$$

where $a \approx -3$, b and c are constants, τ is the period of oscillation and $M_{\rm V} \propto \log d$ — d is the distance to the star — is the V-band magnitude. General relativity predicts that $\tau \propto G^{-1/2}$ and so in unscreened stars we expect the period to be shorter. This relation has been empirically calibrated using local group stars and hence applies in screened situations. In unscreened galaxies, the relation will have different values for the constants and so if one uses this relation to estimate the distance then it will not be correct and will disagree with a different distance estimate obtained using a distance indicator that is insensitive to gravitational physics. Indeed, perturbing

the relation one finds

$$\frac{\Delta d}{d} \approx -0.3 \frac{\Delta G}{G}, \tag{4}$$

where Δd is the difference between the chameleon and general relativity distance. Since $\Delta G/G$ is radially-dependent in chameleon theories, we need some procedure for averaging $G_{\rm eff}$ over the star. In 1950, Epstein[15] numerically calculated a weighting function for the importance of different regions of the star for the pulsation and we have recreated this function using the numerical values in his paper. Using MESA models for stars at the blue edge of the instability strip, we have calculated $\Delta G \equiv \langle G_{\rm eff} \rangle - G$ by averaging the radial profile of $G_{\rm eff}$ for many different values of χ_0 and α and calculated the resultant theoretical prediction for $\Delta d/d$.[16]

Tip of the red giant branch (TRGB) distances are found using a method insensitive to gravitational physics. Any deviation between the TRGB distance and Cepheid distance therefore probes chameleon gravity. Figure 3 below shows a comparison of the two distance estimates for a sample of screened and unscreened galaxies taken from the screening map of.[11] One can see that there is a good agreement and, as a further example, we plot the best fitting curves for $\Delta d/d$ vs the TRGB distance and indicate the predictions from two different chameleon models indicated in the caption. Again, there is a good agreement with the general relativity prediction $\Delta d/d = 0$.



Fig. 3. *Left*: A comparison of the Cepheid and TRGB distances to the galaxies in the screened (black data points) and unscreened (red data points) galaxy samples. *Right*: $\Delta d/d$ as a function of $d_{\rm TRGB}$. The black and red lines show the best-fitting relations for the screened and unscreened galaxy samples respectively. The solid green line shows our theoretical prediction for $\chi_0 = 10^{-6}$, $\alpha = 1/3$ and the dashed green line shows the prediction for $\chi_0 = 4 \times 10^{-7}$, $\alpha = 1$.

We have performed a reduced χ^2 analysis using our predictions for $\Delta d/d$ and have been able to rule out new regions of parameter space, three orders of magnitude below those previously probed.[10] These constraints are shown in figure 4. In

particular, we can place the new bound $\chi_0 < 4\times10^{-7}$ for $f(R)$ theories. Given these bounds, the only objects in the universe that can be unscreened are isolated gas clouds, the smallest dwarf galaxies and very massive ($\geq 10M_\odot$) post-main-sequence stars.



Fig. 4. The new constraints in the χ_0–α plane. The light and dark shaded regions show the regions excluded with 68% and 95% confidence respectively. The black arrow indicates the previous constraint coming from galaxy cluster statistics.

3. Conclusions

By exploiting the novel features exhibited by stars in chameleon theories of gravity we have been able to place new constraints on the model parameters. We have turned the distance ladder, used to calibrate Supernovae distances that led to the discovery of cosmic acceleration, into a new test of gravity. Our analysis above was data-limited — we only have 25 galaxies in our unscreened sample. This is the reason for the jaggedness of the contours in figure 4. With new data, these constraints can be significantly improved.[17]

Astrophysical tests of modified gravity do not require dedicated experiments and can piggyback on current and upcoming experimental surveys. SDSS-IV MaNGA will soon provide a larger sample of galaxies and LSST will provide data pertaining

to variable stars in a variety of different environments. Spitzer will provide infrared data that can reduce the errors on the distance measurements and allowing further constraints to be placed. In addition to chameleon theories, others based on Vainshtein screening may also be tested by comparing compact objects with stars and gas.

The constraints we have placed here are the strongest to date and leave only a small viable region of parameter space. When $\chi_0 < 10^{-8}$ there are no unscreened objects in the universe and the chameleon theories are eliminated for all practical purposes. The next decade will see a plethora of surveys that can be used to test modified gravity theories using methods similar to those presented here.

4. Outlook

In this essay we have used post-main-sequence stars to place the tightest constraints on chameleon theories to date, but there are many other modified theories of gravity—and other screening mechanisms—that are the study of modern research (see[18] for a review). With this in mind, one may wonder about the prospect of using other astrophysical systems to constrain alternate theories of gravity. The fact that similar measurements—TRGB and Cepheid distances—are affected in a qualitatively different manner when the theory of gravity is different from GR was paramount in allowing us to place new constraints. The first step towards constraining other theories is then to identify astrophysical systems where different components respond differently to modified gravity.

One can envision many such systems and so here we will give only one as an illustrative example. Recently, a Cepheid has been observed in an eclipsing binary.[19,20] The eclipsing binary method allows one to measure the masses of both objects (which are both found to be of order $4M_\odot$) but the fact that one is a pulsating Cepheid allows a second, independent measurement of its mass using the period-luminosity-mass (P-L-M) relation. Both measurements agree to within 1% and so this system has the potential to place constraints on any theory of gravity where the masses inferred using the P-L-M relation and the eclipsing binary technique do not agree. These are any theories where either the interior of the Cepheid is unscreened or the orbital motion of two bodies is not Keplarian, for example, this is the case for theories that screen using the Vainshtein mechanism.[21] To date, this system has not been utilised to constrain alternate theories of gravity but clearly it merits further investigation.

Acknowledgements

JS is grateful to collaborators on the various papers used as the basis for this essay: Anne-Christine Davis, Eugene A. Lim and Douglas J. Shaw. We would like to thank Phillip Chang, Lam Hui, Justin Khoury and Mark Trodden for insightful discussions. This essay was written whilst JS was a visiting fellow at the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by

the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Economic Development & Innovation.

References

1. R. Bean and M. Tangmatitham, *Phys.Rev.* **D81** (2010) 083534, arXiv:1002.4197 [astro-ph.CO].
2. Supernova Search Team Collaboration (A. G. Riess *et al.*), *Astron.J.* **116** (1998) 1009, arXiv:astro-ph/9805201 [astro-ph].
3. Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration (S. Perlmutter *et al.*), *Astrophys.J.* **517** (1999) 565, arXiv:astro-ph/9812133 [astro-ph].
4. E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **D15** (2006) 1753, arXiv:hep-th/0603057 [hep-th].
5. T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, *Phys.Rept.* **513** (2012) 1, arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO].
6. J. Khoury and A. Weltman, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **93** (2004) 171104, arXiv:astro-ph/0309300 [astro-ph].
7. J. Khoury and A. Weltman, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 044026, arXiv:astro-ph/0309411.
8. D. Kapner, T. Cook, E. Adelberger, J. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **98** (2007) 021101, arXiv:hep-ph/0611184 [hep-ph].
9. P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A.-C. Davis and D. J. Shaw, *Phys.Rev.* **D78** (2008) 104021, arXiv:0806.3415 [astro-ph].
10. F. Schmidt, M. V. Lima, H. Oyaizu and W. Hu, *Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 083518, arXiv:0812.0545 [astro-ph].
11. A. Cabre, V. Vikram, G.-B. Zhao, B. Jain and K. Koyama, *JCAP* **1207** (2012) 034, arXiv:1204.6046 [astro-ph.CO].
12. A.-C. Davis, E. A. Lim, J. Sakstein and D. Shaw, *Phys.Rev.* **D85** (2012) 123006, arXiv:1102.5278 [astro-ph.CO].
13. B. Paxton *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **192** (2011) 3, arXiv:1009.1622 [astro-ph.SR].
14. B. Paxton, M. Cantiello, P. Arras, L. Bildsten, E. F. Brown *et al.* (2013) arXiv:1301.0319 [astro-ph.SR].
15. I. Epstein, *Astrophys. J.* **112** (July 1950) 6.
16. B. Jain, V. Vikram and J. Sakstein, *Astrophys.J.* **779** (2013) 39, arXiv:1204.6044 [astro-ph.CO].
17. J. Sakstein, *Phys.Rev.* **D88** (2013) 124013, arXiv:1309.0495 [astro-ph.CO].
18. A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury and M. Trodden (2014) arXiv:1407.0059 [astro-ph.CO].
19. G. Pietrzynski, I. Thompson, W. Gieren, D. Graczyk, G. B. A. Udalski *et al.* (2010) arXiv:1012.0231 [astro-ph.GA].
20. M. Marconi, R. Molinaro, G. Bono, G. Pietrzynski, W. Gieren *et al.*, *Astrophys.J.* **768** (2013) L6, arXiv:1304.0860 [astro-ph.SR].
21. T. Hiramatsu, W. Hu, K. Koyama and F. Schmidt, *Phys.Rev.* **D87** (2013) 063525, arXiv:1209.3364 [hep-th].